



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
January 19, 1999

ATTENDEES

Bob Betterton, Point Sources Committee
Dennis Beauregard, Point Sources Committee
Steve Bromberg, Steering Committee
Cyril Durrenberger, Steering Committee
Bill Kuykendal, Quality Assurance Committee
Carolyn Lozo, Area Sources Committee
Chuck Mann, Area Sources Committee
Chuck Masser, Area Sources Committee
Ethan McMahon, Greenhouse Gases Committee
Tom Pace, PM-2.5 Committee
Herb Sherrow, Steering Committee
Greg Stella, Projections Committee
Lee Tooly, Data Management Committee
Roger Westman, Steering Committee
Garry Brooks, ERG
Linda Cooper, ERG

GENERAL ISSUES

Reports on the status and progress of active committees were given, followed by discussion of general interest items.

Area Sources Committee

Chuck Mann reported on progress this committee has made since the last call in October. They finalized the asphalt paving document, they completed the documents on agricultural and prescribed burning for the USDA agriculture work group to review, and work is continuing on the wildfires document. Also, they decided to start two new chapters, one on ammonia from animal husbandry and fertilizer and one on unpaved roads. In addition, they completed the list of frequently asked questions (FAQs) and submitted it the Steering Committee for review. Steve Bromberg added that he had circulated this for EPA's policy review and asked for comments by January 20. Steve will consolidate comments and send them to Chuck Mann. Other miscellaneous documents and abstracts are in progress. Carolyn Lozo asked about the auto refinishing chapter and Chuck responded there was no progress to report. Their next committee conference call is January 20, and they plan to

identify new candidate subjects for work. Karla Smith, a committee member in Texas, is checking a number of categories regarding potentially updating some existing documents.

Cyril Durrenburger asked if there was any news about PM-fine emissions and whether anyone would be attending the North American Research Strategy on Tropospheric Ozone (NARSTO) meeting the following week in Washington, DC. With the new chapters being started, he thought it might be helpful to attend. No one knew of anyone attending the NARSTO meeting and Steve suggested deferring the question until Tom Pace of the PM-2.5 Committee arrived.

Point Sources Committee

Bob Betterton reported on this committee's work and December 17 conference call. They discussed the draft paper on how operational problems affect point source emission estimates. They will discuss equipment malfunctions as they pertain to rule effectiveness at their next call on January 26. He noted that EPA co-chair Roy Huntley had identified a lot of resources for compiling a document, which they will address during their next conference call.

To summarize guidance document status, they expect to finalize the semiconductor manufacturing document in January. The oil and gas field production and processing document has been sent out to the committee for final review and comment, and the plastics products manufacturing document was finalized in December. In addition, they are trying to identify new categories for document development and Bob asked if the group could recommend other issues for study by the PSC. Dennis Beauregard added that there were no more topics to address on his list. Cyril asked what categories had been considered for possible study and Bob mentioned chemical manufacturing, wood products manufacturing, and graphic arts. Cyril asked whether there was enough interest to pursue the chemical and wood manufacturing industries, and that there have been major changes in the field of graphic arts, specifically with inks and processes. Dennis responded that ERG had put together a document proposing additional topics to consider, but there had not been much enthusiasm for suggested topics, and perhaps they have completed their mission or need to redefine it. Cyril added that he thought all topics were important; however, if some were not being studied further, the reasons for this omission should be documented. Steve confirmed that this should be documented.

Dennis noted that the Area Sources Committee had done a document on graphic arts, and he was unsure if more topics should be pursued. He noted that ERG was doing work for the Emissions Standards Division on the printing and graphic arts industry associated with the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA). A guidance document might be helpful, but there had been no general committee consensus on pursuing graphic arts. The committee had discussed developing a document on control efficiencies for fine PM, and plan to continue those discussions in January. Dennis also asked about the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) reporting rule. He noted their committee was not agreeing on which source categories to develop guidance, and perhaps more thought should be given to whom EIIP is developing guidance for. Cyril asked to see the list of additional source categories that had been considered but for which there was not sufficient enthusiasm to pursue, and indicated he may recruit someone to take more interest in this committee's work.

Quality Assurance Committee

Steve reported for Bill Kuykendal that this committee had produced a white paper on verification/validation issues associated with inventory data that was almost ready for external review after EPA's comments were addressed. Depending on the extent of the comments, the document will likely be released soon as an external draft.

Data Management Committee

Lee Tooty noted that as reported last time, this committee was inactive and expect to remain so at this time. Their products, the EIIP Data Model and data transfer protocols, are being used and examined for applicability in larger agency information management initiatives. Accomplishments include a paper given at the AWMA conference, which will be published, summarizing the results of the EIIP Data Transfer Protocol, and EFIG's use of the EIIP Data Model to redesign their database and the new input format for state and local agencies. She emphasized that even though their work was wrapped up and the committee was inactive, their products are still active and being used. If they do work in FY99, they will need to redefine their goals with the exception of the work of the source classification code (SCC) Subcommittee that is continuing. Steve added that from the EIIP perspective, their work is done and their products are being used.

Projections Committee

Greg Stella reported that this group has an aggressive schedule to develop two documents. One is on nonroad mobile sources, for which they expect to post their third draft the following week on the EIIP World Wide Web site. He added that EPA's Office of Mobile Sources (OMS) is participating in the effort by supplying information from its nonroad mobile model project. The second is a parallel document on point sources, for which they would like to use the knowledge and expertise of the Point Sources Committee for review and comment. They expect to have the first draft ready by February 9 and hope to complete the document during the summer. This will be a broad overview of what has been done and specifically focuses on methods and models. They plan to use a "living" document approach, with it being on-line and referencing the nonroad model and the MOBILE6 model, with references to various Web pages.

Greenhouse Gases Committee

Ethan McMahon reported that they had posted all 15 of their draft chapters on the EIIP Web site for review. They have received only a few external comments, so they are not sure if the documents are fine or people do not know they are there. They expect comments from OMS on the mobile source sections. He asked if the committee co-chairs have seen the documents. He noted that a few chapters should be of special interest, specifically the introduction to estimating GHG emissions. Others of special interest would depend on the readers' committee interest; 3 chapters are relevant to point sources, 10 chapters to area sources, and 2 chapters to mobile sources. Steve noted that he had reviewed these before the holidays, and he had format comments but not substantive content

comments. He added that if people cannot look at all 15, they should pick a few to review and get comments to Ethan as soon as possible. Chuck Mann asked about commenting later since he did not have time now, and Ethan responded that was fine. He added that he wants these documents to be useful to the overall inventory community and that it is not a big leap to look at new gases. Once these 15 chapters are finalized, they are unsure if they will pursue more sources or other directions. Their committee has been discussing reviewing other committees' existing EIIP chapters to add GHG information, but they are not sure if they have enough funding or if this is a high enough priority. He pointed out one difference is that most existing EIIP documents focus on inventories at the facility level, but their work is at the state level.

PM-2.5 Committee

Tom Pace reported that this committee was responding to comments on their draft white paper posted on the EIIP Web page on the state of the science on PM-fines inventories. Comments are coming in slowly, so they are not sure if the document is fine or users do not know it has been posted. They have received some supportive comments. It is possible to move the draft out of the committee and to the Steering Committee for publication soon. Also, another corollary project is underway: developing a list of key terms and definitions, but this is not new material. There is also interest in a "getting started" document on PM inventories, with links to the EIIP Web page and others to bring together inventory information. They have just started discussing this and their contractor is preparing to pull together a proposal on this. Their next call will be the week of February 8.

OTHER BUSINESS

STAPPA/ALAPCO Survey

Steve reported that he had developed a survey and circulated it for review as a follow-up to the fall 1998 Standing Air Emissions Work Group (SAEWG) meeting. The survey addresses the EIIP's future after 2000. Comments are due the week of January 18, and after this the survey will be sent to the STAPPA/ALAPCO membership for distribution in April. The goal is to get state and local agency feedback on whether EIIP should continue after 2000. If the feedback is negative, Steve expects no FY2000 funding and remaining funds will be used to close down the program. If results are positive, Steve plans to develop a proposal between May and October with input from the Steering Committee and Committee co-chairs at an EIIP reinventing meeting. The survey results will be compiled and summarized in time for the May SAEWG meeting.

1999 Programs and Funding

Steve noted that the committees were doing a lot of good work and he recommended efforts continue and possibly be speeded up. Committees should not hold off on spending FY98 carryover funds even though the FY99 105 grant funds have not been received yet. He added that the EIIP is OK now on funding and to let him know if any problems arise due to the late arrival of FY99 funds. For committees uncertain about whether they had done all they were supposed to or are struggling with lack of participation by members, he advised continuing for now with current work. Do the best you can even if only committee co-chairs are participating. In May, more information from the STAPPA/ALAPCO survey results will be available to help make decisions for future activities.

EIIP Updates

Steve reported that the January issue was available and to let him know if there were any problems in accessing the electronic version posted on the EIIP Web page because of some reports of getting blank screens. Four hundred copies were printed for agency directors and those not likely to retrieve the Web page version and should be mailed this week or the next. He would like to get the next issue out in early April to coincide with the STAPPA/ALAPCO meeting. He would like it to include features summarizing the PM-2.5 Committee's work on their white paper, as well as a feature on the Data Management Committee's work, accomplishments, and major products. In order to potentially solicit additional input, Steve also asked Bob Betterton for about a half page write-up on the topics the Point Sources Committee has considered but declined to develop guidance for because of insufficient interest. Write-ups should be sent to Steve by mid-March. He will send out a request for status summaries to all committees.

STEERING COMMITTEE

Communication

Steve expressed concern that his last faxed notice about cancelling the December conference call was not received by at least two members. He would like to try e-mail as hopefully more reliable for sending out information about upcoming calls. All members are to send their e-mail addresses to Steve. Linda Cooper is to follow up and get e-mail addresses for members not participating on this call.

Next Call

The next EIIP teleconference call was scheduled for Tuesday, February 23, at 3 p.m. EST. The call-in number is (919) 541-4328.



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
February 23, 1999

ATTENDEES

Bob Betterton, Point Sources Committee
Dennis Beauregard, Point Sources Committee
Steve Bromberg, Steering Committee
Bill Kuykendal, Quality Assurance Committee
Chuck Mann, Area Sources Committee
Mohammed Mazeed, Projections Committee
Ethan McMahon, Greenhouse Gases Committee
Sam Sadler, Greenhouse Gases Committee
Tom Pace, PM-2.5 Committee
Greg Stella, Projections Committee
Linda Cooper, ERG
Darcy Wilson, ERG

GENERAL ISSUES

Reports on the status and progress of active committees were given, followed by discussion of general interest items.

Area Sources Committee

Chuck Mann reported on progress this committee has made since the last call in January. They finalized the external draft of the structure fires document and an abstract on vehicle fires. Work continued on the draft document on wildfires and it is nearly ready for USDA review. Chuck added that for all the rest of their current efforts work was in progress. Steve Bromberg noted he had received an e-mail, which he had forwarded to Chuck, from someone who had requested assistance with some draft documents. Steve asked Chuck if he had been able to help. Chuck responded that he did not recall receiving such a message and Steve said he would resend it.

Point Sources Committee

Bob Betterton reported on this committee's work. They received comments from the semiconductor manufacturers Intel and Motorola for Chapter 6. Following a final editorial review, they anticipate it will be finalized in March. Chapter 10 on oil and gas field production and processing was revised and is ready for committee review. Also, they have done an overview of the biggest chemical

(inorganic and organic) manufacturing industries and expect to decide on their next committee call whether to start a document on this topic.

Bob noted that they had started scoping work on a document entitled “Effects of Operating Problems on Emissions,” to address emission source operations and control device efficiencies and specifically how to factor both of these topics into the emission estimation process. Steve added background on this effort and said that this committee tried to clarify guidance on rule effectiveness (RE); a paper on RE was posted on the EIIP World Wide Web site for awhile. The PSC was constrained in clarifying this topic and it almost became a hopeless task because of different interpretations. Bob and the PSC were trying to supplement new definitions and clarifications, which depend on the information they are now putting together. He hopes they are able to clarify this and end the controversy on RE. He also noted that some emission inventory guidance refers to earlier documents on RE, so better guidance is needed.

Dennis Beauregard added that a subcategory of the topic was addressed in a paper prepared by ERG on process upsets and malfunctions. The PSC decided to incorporate this paper into a new document addressing control device efficiencies. He noted that the idea of control effectiveness aligns with EIIP concepts. The PSC is reviewing available literature on this in attempts to limit the scope of their effort as well as address additional source categories and criteria pollutants. Steve asked when everything would come together. Dennis responded that work was underway, but he was not sure and hoped satisfactory progress would occur in the next few weeks. Dennis added that if they are unable to make progress on this topic it would be a problem for the Projections Committee because they need this information.

Projections Committee

Greg Stella reported that this group has made progress on their document on nonroad mobile sources and had posted their fourth draft on the EIIP World Wide Web site for external review. Also, work has continued on their point sources overview document, which they hope to post on the EIIP Web site by the end of the week. He added that work has proceeded more slowly than they had hoped and they were looking forward to the RE information from the Point Sources Committee.

Quality Assurance Committee

Bill Kuykendal reported that this committee was still working on the verification/validation issues associated with inventory data. He was supposed to complete the verification/validation draft chapter by the end of February, but this would slip until March.

Greenhouse Gases Committee

Sam Sadler reported that Ethan McMahon had received comments on their documents. Also, Ethan has announced he was moving to EPA’s information and statistics office in a few weeks. Sam thought their work was done except for finalizing their documents. Steve asked if someone will make

sure their documents all get done. Ethan responded yes and that Wiley Barbour would, given their funding level. Steve noted that these documents are definitely part of the EIIP series. He posed a more general question about whether to incorporate GHG emission inventory methods into other committees' documents, which pertains to discussions on EIIP's future. Should addressing GHGs be a function of existing committees or remain that of a separate committee? Steve noted EIIP's future would be addressed later on this call.

PM-2.5 Committee

Tom Pace reported that this committee had their call the previous week and they had discussed the need to "jump start" the states' PM inventory work. The committee felt that states needed to be offered regionalized training support. He explained that the committee was recommending regionalized training because the Western states have done work on PM-2.5 but the Eastern states have not. A more immediate need for basic discussion on PM sources would be beneficial to Eastern states' planning for inventory efforts. He noted that Western states probably do not need such basic information because of their extensive experience with the Grand Canyon inventory effort. He added that California already has detailed PM inventories and that Texas is in the middle in their level of experience with PM inventories. Therefore, their committee concluded that there is a definite need for training especially in the East to "level" the knowledge on the topic, but more detailed training is needed for both parts of the country. Given this, Tom asked what the Steering Committee thinks.

Steve asked about their Web site. Tom responded that their contractor, PES, had begun work on a "getting started" Web site on tools and guidance. It will offer basic information and links to pollutant-specific information, plus links to specific tools to pull this effort together. This work is a outgrowth of their state-of-the-science paper on PM that is about finished and nearly ready to be sent to the Steering Committee and released to the general public.

OTHER BUSINESS

STAPPA/ALAPCO Survey and Program Planning

Steve reported that he had received confirmation that the survey addressing the EIIP's future after 2000 will go out in April, as planned, to agency directors for "voting" on whether to continue the program. He expects to know the outcome by the STAPPA/ALAPCO meeting in May. Therefore, one of the most important needs is to start planning how to continue or wind up EIIP.

If the vote is not to continue EIIP, a termination plan is needed, so Steve asked that all committees start thinking of orderly ways to wind up their work and prepare estimates on the timeframe and effort to do this. If chapters planned have not been started but a committee feels they are important

and should still be prepared, the estimates should include this. He noted that there is still a fair amount of FY98 and all of FY99 funding available and some pressure to spend these resources has started.

Alternatively, if EIIP is asked to continue, committees' plans for future work should be also be developed and include continuing work on current documents as well as other ways to continue EIIP's efforts. Steve suspects EIIP may shift to a different focus though, for example, on training. Another important question to consider is whether the committee structure is the best organization or are there other or better ways to continue EIIP's efforts. Therefore, everyone should think about the future and how best to proceed. Steve wants the development of EIIP's future plans to be underway when word arrives on whether to continue the program. One possibility is to have a "summit" meeting like that held a year ago, which would occur after word is received to determine plans. Steve would like feedback via phone or e-mail in March on short- and long-term plans and goals.

Chuck asked about the timeframe for ending EIIP if it is not extended. Steve responded that this depends on the amount of money available and how it is allocated, e.g., are there hot topics to address before efforts are wound up? Essentially there is no time limit and work could continue at a reasonable rate. Dennis asked about document maintenance activities and if it was appropriate to revise documents prepared earlier. If EIIP is asked to close down, Steve answered that the committees could review their EIIP documents and allocate funds to update them as needed. Resources are not available for major rewrites, but priority should be given to addressing any possible errors to correct or important new information to include so all EIIP documents are as good as they can be. Regarding document maintenance, a question on this is included on the STAPPA/ALAPCO survey (e.g., If EIIP is closed down, how should document maintenance be handled?). Steve added that this particular need must be acknowledged as important and someone would need to take this on. He concluded this discussion by stressing the importance of this topic; now is the time for everyone to do brainstorming and give it serious thought.

EIIP Updates

Steve reminded everyone that the next issue would be sent out in April and feature work of the PM-2.5 and Data Management Committees. He needs one-page write-ups for these committees by March 12. All the other committees should prepare a half-page write-up on their work status and plans to fill out the issue. He wants to get the latest information out at the same time the agency directors are deciding EIIP's future and stressed that all the write-ups should emphasize the importance of the work.

STEERING COMMITTEE

Next Call

The next EIIP teleconference call was scheduled for Tuesday, March 23, at 3 p.m. EST. The call-in number is (919) 541-4328.



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
March 23, 1999

ATTENDEES

Wiley Barbour, Greenhouse Gases Committee
Dennis Beauregard, Point Sources Committee
Bob Betterton, Point Sources Committee
Steve Bromberg, Steering Committee
Roy Huntley, Point Sources Committee
Chuck Mann, Area Sources Committee
Sam Sadler, Greenhouse Gases Committee
Greg Stella, Projections Committee
Garry Brooks, ERG
Linda Cooper, ERG

GENERAL ISSUES

Reports on the status and progress of active committees were given, followed by discussion of general interest items.

Greenhouse Gases Committee

Sam Sadler began the report for this committee and noted that their documents are nearly ready for publication except for questions Wiley Barbour had about some ratings in their documents' Data Attribute Rating System (DARS) tables. Minor changes are needed to their documents, which their contractor, ICF, will do. Then they will submit the documents to be posted on the EIIP World Wide Web site. Steve Bromberg asked if they planned to use an EPA report number on their final documents. Sam answered yes and that the documents would be distributed through the National Service Center for Environmental Publications. Wiley added that their documents were almost done except for some last-minute tweaks, and he asked about including the GHG documents on the next Air Chief CD. Steve was not certain about the schedule but replied that a CD was planned and would include everything ready till the cutoff, which was in July last year. Steve asked that if there were any other tasks EIIP could help with to please let him know. He added that EIIP offers a great resource for corporate professionals to participate and that EIIP needs new members if the program continues, and this would help bring new perspectives.

Point Sources Committee

Bob Betterton reported on this committee's latest call, which was March 1. They have decided to table work on their draft chapter on organic and inorganic chemical manufacturing. He emphasized this effort was simply on hold for now, which does not mean they will not complete this work. Chapter 6, *Semiconductor Manufacturing*, was finalized and has been posted on the EIIP Web site. Committee comments on Chapter 10, *Oil and Gas Field Production and Processing*, were incorporated by ERG and the document was submitted for a limited round of external review. Work has recently started on their new document on control device performance, which is being referred to as Chapter 12. It will address not only control efficiency, but also how well controls work, failure rates, and possibly rule effectiveness issues associated with equipment malfunctions. It may also include information on catalyst efficiency, such as comparisons of the efficiency of new versus cleaned catalysts. They are viewing this effort as basically an information-gathering effort (i.e., a "cut and paste" job) and not new research. They have prepared an outline and are drafting example tables that will be included and contain a summary of the data collected (e.g., process operation, control device type, control efficiency, pollutant(s) affected). Their projected schedule is to have a draft to external review as soon as possible and a final draft by the end of the fiscal year.

Area Sources Committee

Chuck Mann reported on the progress of this committee. Their Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document is close to being finalized, with only reviews by Steve and himself remaining. Several abstract documents are in production, and an outline for their unpaved roads chapter has been completed. They also expect the open burning document to be finalized soon. Steve asked if they were planning to start any new documents. Chuck responded not now and they had been waiting for information from this call since the future of EIIP was the number one question.

Projections Committee

Greg Stella reported on this group's progress. The third draft of their document on nonroad mobile sources has been posted on the EIIP Web site for external review. They are now working on the second draft of their point sources overview document. Also, they are beginning work on chapters on area sources and onroad motor vehicles. Greg asked a question about external review of documents, and specifically whether this was done by members of the Steering Committee or by reviewers outside of EIIP. Steve responded that both were good, noting that other committees should have an opportunity for review, but a special strength of the program was in obtaining reviews external to EIIP to avoid efforts becoming "in-bred." He added that typically the committee co-chairs identify peer reviewers. Dennis Beauregard also added that contacts at state and local agencies were often fairly extensive, and for one of their documents they had contacted all state and local agencies although they had not gotten responses from them all. Greg said their work was still on track and they expect to complete their documents by July. He expressed concern that many users were waiting for their guidance, and he was unsure they were getting the necessary support and input. Steve suggested contacting environmental organizations to get input as well as state and local agencies. Greg mentioned

one case where a couple agencies were trying to develop projections, and lack of interest was not a problem but lack of direction on where to concentrate efforts was.

OTHER BUSINESS

The Future of EIIP

Steve prefaced this discussion by noting this was to be the main topic of discussion. He reiterated that EIIP's future depends on how STAPPA/ALAPCO votes, which could go two ways. One is that funding for EIIP could be stopped at the end of FY99, and this would then mean that committees would need to complete work underway and perform any updates to completed documents as necessary. One issue with this scenario is how to maintain EIIP documents in the future. Although a question on this was included on the survey, Steve wants the Steering Committee to have a plan developed as well in case a "good" response is not received from the survey. The second possibility is for EIIP to continue, in which case another proposal for future EIIP work will be needed. Steve posed the question, "How would EIIP look?" in this case, and answered by saying he suspected it would be considerably different. He envisions having another "summit" meeting to decide how to approach this. Steve said new ideas are needed and he encouraged thinking "outside the box." Steve concluded his initial thoughts by reminding participants that on the February call he had asked the committees to start polling their individual members, and he asked to hear the committees' feedback.

Chuck Mann presented feedback for the Area Sources Committee and said they thought no radical changes were needed. In general, their products are perceived as useful and they need to do more, i.e., more source categories and more pollutants, especially toxics. Therefore, how should this be approached? A toxics committee is an option, or a change in the priorities of committees is OK too. Steve asked if they still had a list of source categories to standardize. Chuck responded no, but he could develop a list. He explained that about 4 years ago his committee had developed a list, but the pollutants addressed were only ozone precursors. There are still source categories with no emission factors. The question about document maintenance still needs to be addressed regardless of the STAPPA/ALAPCO survey results. Documents need to be updated to reflect changes with time in topics of interest, new regulations, and new Source Classification Codes. Another question to address is coordination with EPA's Regional Offices, who seem to be taking the lead on developing emission inventory methods for toxics. Chuck added that the Regional Offices should be more involved with toxics inventories. He asked who is taking the lead on this topic, and should it be EIIP.

Dennis expressed a preference for the same committee composition, but noted a need for fresh "blood." Chuck agreed that this needed to be addressed, and suggested brainstorming on what works best. Dennis responded that the Point Sources Committee (PSC) has worked well, but some current members seem to be losing interest in the committee's work. He noted that PSC members have

addressed their most pressing concerns, but he added that if new members participated, new issues may be presented. He suggested that a better job was needed of identifying emerging inventory issues. Bob Betterton added that toxics need to be addressed. Steve asked why the PSC's document on chemical manufacturing industries was now on hold and if this was a funding issue. Bob responded that funding was having an impact on their work, and if there were more certainty about EIIP's future that the PSC would probably have more than one new document underway. Dennis added that the work with toxics was the same as that with PM-2.5 in that EIIP works best when there is information to gather; if there is none to gather, they cannot do much. The PSC saw this with their last three documents on oil and gas production, plastics, and semiconductors. If there is no AP-42 section on a topic, trying to make sense of emissions information is harder, especially if efforts are close to emission factor work. Essentially they are running out of easy tasks, so how should PM-2.5 and toxics be addressed?

Steve asked Garry Brooks if there was a wealth of information available that they could tap into and how many state toxics inventories were received as part of the National Toxics Inventory (NTI) effort. Garry responded that 38 state inventories had been received and almost all were for point sources, with almost none for mobile or area sources. Steve also asked about how data were collected, and did states use standardized methods to develop their estimates. Garry replied that full documentation had not been submitted by most states, but for those that had, ERG passed it along to EPA, but there was not a lot of useable methods information. He added that the draft 1996 NTI would be made available to states for their review on May 1, 1999. As a result of state review, a lot more information may be available by summer. This groundwork would be a good starting point for toxics. Garry also noted that a huge effort was underway at EPA's Office of Mobile Sources on both onroad and nonroad sources. He added that area sources data were probably the weakest, with fewer than five states submitting any.

Chuck mentioned document maintenance, and said this needed to be a "how to" topic, not an "if" topic. He stressed the importance of EIIP materials needing to change over time and not getting stale or outdated so EIIP materials do not outlive their usefulness. Steve noted that even if EIIP closes down, some remaining funds could be available to use to update documents periodically. He emphasized the need for ongoing document review and update, and he would like to develop a system to ensure that documents remain useful. EPA may need to take responsibility for this, but this would be his last choice.

Greg Stella commented that the Projections Committee document was being developed as a "living" document with links to other Web sites. The approach could be something other committees may want to pursue further; however, they may be hampered somewhat by the amount of static documentation that already exists for their documents. Theoretically, in the Projections Committee approach, the guidance document can be better kept up-to-date since the document references will be updated whenever the linked Web sites are updated. The goal of this approach is to lessen future maintenance needs since the majority of the references would not have to be re-investigated for changes. Essentially, the goal would be for the guidance to change and evolve as the linked references

and documentation changes. Greg stressed the importance of maintaining the latest information available.

Dennis commented on the need to get fresh ideas from people not now involved with EIIP. Steve agreed that fresh ideas were needed and he definitely planned to do this and to invite participation from those who want to be involved.

STEERING COMMITTEE

Next Call

Steve recommended having no call in April, but to do the next one in May after the STAPPA/ALAPCO meeting. The next EIIP teleconference call was tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, May 25, at 3 p.m. EDT. If a call is needed sooner, Steve will send out an e-mail. The call-in number will be (919) 541-4328.



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
May 25, 1999

ATTENDEES

Bob Betterton, Point Sources Committee
Steve Bromberg, Steering Committee
Roy Huntley, Point Sources Committee
Bill Kuykendal, QA Committee
Chuck Mann, Area Sources Committee
Chuck Masser, Area Sources Committee
Garry Brooks, ERG
Linda Cooper, ERG

GENERAL ISSUES

Steering Committee

No reports on the status and progress of active committees were given, and the entire call focused on the results of the STAPPA/ALAPCO survey followed by discussion of relevant topics including EIIP's future and funding.

STAPPA/ALAPCO Survey

Steve Bromberg began with an overview for those who may not yet have seen the survey results. Of 41 respondents, 35 have used one or more documents, which was a high percentage of those responding. Most found the documents easy to use, complete, and technically accurate. Most said that EIIP should continue. The main question is how will the program be funded, and discussion of this was tabled for later during the call.

Steve noted that a big benefit of the survey was that it indicates respondents knew a lot about EIIP and the information it provides; it also offered good suggestions on what can be done in the future. From the state and local agency perspective, EIIP is worth continuing. The question this raises is what should EIIP look like? From both survey results and a letter from Mike Koerber with LADCO (Lake Michigan Air Directors Consortium), recommendations are to move away from providing specific guidance to different directions.

Steve asked that remaining discussion focus on this and how to redefine or re-engineer EIIP in the next 4 to 6 weeks. He would like to define broad areas to look at and said to think bigger than we

are now. Do not be constrained to developing guidance--anything goes. What should the "anything" consist of? Steve is working on having a meeting in the RTP area in late July or early August, where some current EIIP members and several individual not now associated with the program can do brainstorming and develop and plan strategies to re-invent EIIP for the next several years. Preceding this meeting, the Steering Committee and several inventory experts will develop broad guidelines for the future program.

In terms of having the meeting, he noted one concern about mechanisms to fund state and local agency personnel travel. The previously used mechanism through WESTAR is no longer an option. He reported that EFIG does not have resources, but that the Mid-Atlantic Regional Air Management Association (MARAMA) has agreed to help, although he has not yet confirmed this. Bob Betterton added that Title V funds may be an option and could possibly cover emission inventory meeting work.

Steve would like the upcoming committee calls to focus on where participants want to see EIIP go or where it should go. Do not be constrained by the current committee structure. Some committees may be dissolved and new ones created. Such discussion will help for two reasons: to help identify new directions for EIIP in the future and, more immediately, new ideas or directions for the current working committees to present in the next issue of the *EIIP Update* newsletter (see below).

Overall, Steve believes the outlook for EIIP is quite positive. Many think the program is very valuable and that it should not be limited to products geared only toward the inventory community. Several other constituents are possible, such as the permitting community, and other potential possibilities should be identified. Steve is hoping new ideas and participants will be useful in redefining EIIP's work in the future. Garry Brooks noted that the U.S. Department of the Interior is a new user of EIIP products because their emission inventory process specified that EIIP procedures be used to prepare inventories.

Also, Chuck Mann asked Steve about getting a copy of the actual survey responses received, which might be useful to identify where EIIP might have fallen short, as well as a way to get committee members involved. He also asked if any respondents said they would be willing to help. Steve answered that nine groups responded that they were interested in helping and that he will try to obtain the surveys from STAPPA/ALAPCO.

Funding

Steve noted that funds are still available and that work can proceed at a hefty pace, although the long-term funding issue is still not resolved. He also noted that EIIP is still in the STAPPA/ALAPCO budget for FY2000. The STAPPA/ALAPCO Steering Committee has indicated an objection to using Section 105 grant funds. Steve will pursue the lead that Bob Betterton suggested earlier about Title V funds, especially if less objections to this route are likely. He concluded this topic by summarizing that there are no short-term funding problems but that this is an issue for a viable long-term program. EIIP must not only identify what directions into which the program could move, but also find a way to pay for it. Taking the program in new directions may make it easier for decision-makers

to commit to future funding. This is why it is important to proceed with program planning this summer. Funding probabilities will likely be higher if the EIIP has a well planned and well received future program.

Another concern about funding pertains to continuing work through the end of the current fiscal year. Steve asked that all committees make sure their contractors are funded and let him know of any shortages. Steve noted that the QA Committee can now complete their work on verification and validation issues, and the Point Sources Committee might have shelved some work for which work assignments can be put in place for the beginning of the new fiscal year. Chuck Mann noted that the Area Sources Committee had adequate funding to complete what they had started this fiscal year. They could reallocate resources to new EIIP directions or could continue work not yet completed if it were for a category for which guidance was more pressing.

EIIP Update

As noted during earlier discussion, the next issue of the newsletter will focus on where EIIP will or can go in the future. Steve asked that each committee send about three-quarters of a page of text on forward-thinking ideas for things to do by June 30 so the issue can go out by the end of July. Steve reminded all committees to try and stop thinking about EIIP in the old way and instead move beyond the current committee boundaries.

STEERING COMMITTEE

Next Call

The next EIIP teleconference call was tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, June 22, at 3 p.m. EDT. Steve will send out an e-mail notice reminder with an agenda. The call-in number will be (919) 541-4328.



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
June 22, 1999

ATTENDEES

Tom Ballou, QA Committee
Bob Betterton, Point Sources Committee
Steve Bromberg, Steering Committee
Roy Huntley, Point Sources Committee
Bill Kuykendal, QA Committee
Chuck Mann, Area Sources Committee
Mohammed Mazeed, Projections Committee
Greg Stella, Projections Committee
Lucy Adams, ERG
Linda Cooper, ERG

GENERAL ISSUES

Reports on the status and progress of active committees were given, followed by discussion of general interest items.

Area Sources Committee

Chuck Mann reported for this committee. Their last call was the previous week. For the short term, their budget is adequate to get to the next stage on all the documents that they are currently working on. He is not sure they will get past this point on their documents by the end of FY99 for reasons of time and funds. They did discuss long-term possibilities for re-inventing EIIP and the following ideas were discussed. They still see a need for guidance documents about area sources, particularly sources of air toxics and particulate matter. None were in favor of abandoning their current work areas but suggested ideas for expanding to other areas, such as developing training on inventory methods and data management. Another would be training in applying the methods, and an example of this would be step-by-step procedures for submissions to the National Emissions Trends (NET) database. Live workshops, computer-based training, or a combination of both were suggested. They lamented the lack of high-quality emission factors, and recognized a need for species and temporal allocation factors. They discussed the possibility of having a peer group of EPA, state, and local agency personnel, working in conjunction with an Adopt-A-Factor-type program to develop improved area source factors. Also, peer group coordination between inventory developers and the atmospheric receptor modeling community could make the emission inventory development process more efficient. They also agreed on the need for participation by more state and local agency personnel as well as a need to develop more emissions models. He will write this up for the July issue of the *EIIP Update*.

Projections Committee

Greg Stella reported for this group, whose last call was the previous week. They discussed directions for EIIP's future and are continuing development of guidance documents and other plans. A single overwhelming theme voiced was that as they finish current efforts, they do not want to abandon their current focus while moving toward new areas. None have looked at validation of growth factors but many are very interested in this. Also suggested were updating projections systems and additional review and analysis of projections models, including a more hands-on approach. They discussed emissions controls and the formation of an emissions modeling work group. Greg already spoke with Steve Bromberg about this. If no other committee is looking at spatial or temporal factors, they may take this on as well as emissions modeling and preprocessing. They also have adequate funding to complete their work on their guidance document this year.

Point Sources Committee

Roy Huntley began the report for this committee. At their last call, they talked about outreach and education and agreed on the need to do a better job on these. One comment was made that the EIIP newsletter was not reaching the staff doing emission inventories. On-line training via World Wide Web pages was suggested as was training before the emission inventory workshop held by EFIG in the summer, as opposed to training sponsored by the Air & Waste Management Association (AWMA), which has a high cost that is prohibitive for many not even including travel costs. Another suggestion pertained to a 1990 document on the AIRS (Aerometric Information Retrieval System) Facility Subsystem (AFS) emission factor document. Nothing like it has been done since; updating it was endorsed and work to pursue this has begun.

Bob Betterton reported on issues discussed about national standardized data collection activities and started by describing an example: consider an industrial plant in his state, South Carolina, which is just one owned by a company with many facilities nationwide. They all receive many paper and electronic questionnaires all of which request the same basic information but use many different formats, and each of which must be interpreted by state or local agency personnel. Some of the same information is also requested for permit applications. He explained that it is a disservice to the regulated community and ourselves to basically ask the same questions for the same information but do it differently, which results in situations for misinterpretation. Bob recommended and endorsed consideration of a basic "core" questionnaire requesting the same information for emission inventory data collection or permits, to which each state or local program could add or append more questions.

Roy also recommended preparing a guidance document with a systematic approach to preparing an inventory. Bob added that an emphasis on training using the same methods was already being done by EIIP, including consistent training on preparing an inventory. He also sees a need for inventory training for entry-level personnel nationally as well as at the state level.

QA Committee

Bill Kuykendal noted that this committee's latest guidance document had been done for awhile and their committee had been inactive. Their next call is scheduled for July 1 to develop ideas for EIIP to look at a different orientation and active involvement of inventory sectors. Quality assurance could be an area to do "overhead"-type tasks. He expects to have more ideas to offer at the next teleconference.

OTHER BUSINESS

The Future of EIIP

Steve reported on initial progress on the planning process for the program's future. One brainstorming session was held with the following participants: Dave Allen, University of Texas; Bill Gill (formerly on the EIIP Point Sources Committee), Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission; Doug Solomon, now with EPA but formerly a contractor with a unique view of the state and local agency perspective; Susan Wierman, Mid-Atlantic Regional Air Management Association (MARAMA); and Mark Janssen, Lake Michigan Air Directors Consortium (LADCO), sitting in for Mike Koerber. Another session for this group was scheduled for Monday, June 28.

Three main areas were discussed--institutional, products, and training and outreach--and Steve presented highlights of each. The institutional area involves raising awareness in the community so all understand the importance of inventories. Points raised here were:

- C Encouraging agency organizational changes to improve interactions to collect and use emission inventory data; and
- C Increasing coordination between EPA groups issuing guidance, primarily OAQPS and OMS.

For products, the main point discussed was to continue guidance development and expand it considerably; examples cited were:

- C Emission factors;
- C Activity indicators;
- C Speciation and temporal profiles; and
- C Pollutant-specific information such as on ammonia.

For training and outreach, the focus here included:

- C Instructional materials;
- C A mentoring program in which those more experienced could teach those less experienced about common pitfalls; and
- C Facilitating agency benchmarking (which involves helping fund visits of agency personnel to other agencies to better compare programs and methods).

Steve noted that it was gratifying that what was discussed during this call fit into one of these three areas. Whether some of the specifics were appropriate for EIIP to pursue was questioned, especially emission factors because EIIP must be careful about not undertaking EPA's responsibilities. One more call has been scheduled to examine what was discussed during the first call, and then plans are to continue discussion in greater detail at an August meeting. They plan to prepare examples of programs and projects under each category. Then, following agreement, they will prioritize the order of importance within each major area.

How to manage these three areas operationally was not resolved; the diverse areas do not lend themselves to individual committees. For some, it was felt best to identify community needs first and then address any bureaucracy needs. Identifying priorities in each area was seen as the starting point for a meeting, to be held August 17-18 in the RTP area. Plans are to take the ideas and priorities identified and then develop or describe possible projects for the topics.

Steve explained that in the past WESTAR had funded such meetings and the contractor ERG planned and hosted the meetings, but this time MARAMA will both organize and host the meeting. Invitations will be mailed in early July. Steve asked all state and local participants to make sure he has their correct e-mail and mailing addresses. MARAMA will pay participants' hotel bills and provide vouchers for food, trying to make it as painless as possible. Two facilities are being considered, one in Raleigh and another near the Raleigh-Durham airport; information on which will be selected is expected the following week. Steve expects about 30 attendees, 10 each from EPA, state and local agencies, and the remainder not currently associated with EIIP but representing specific areas such as point, area, or mobile sources or representing a good understanding of inventories in general. He sent a note to the EPA regional coordinators for ideas on attendees and received some but needs more, especially those representing a broader perspective who understand inventory goals.

Funding

Steve asked that work assignments with budgets of about \$10,000 to \$15,000 for FY 2000 be prepared and submitted quickly so placeholders will set up for contractors' work to continue without interruption on October 1. If more details on this are needed, call Steve.

EIIP Update

Steve reminded everyone to send him their write-ups for the newsletter by the end of June for the July issue. He will prepare a summary of the plans to address EIIP's future.

STEERING COMMITTEE

Next Call

Steve recommended having no teleconference call in July, but scheduled one for July 20 that will probably be cancelled in order to prepare for the August meeting. If the July 20 call is needed, it will be at 3 p.m. EDT and the call-in number will be (919) 541-4328. Steve will send out an e-mail to let everyone know whether the July call will be cancelled.



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
September 21, 1999

ATTENDEES

Bob Betterton, Point Sources Committee
Steve Bromberg, Steering Committee
Roy Huntley, Point Sources Committee
Bill Kuykendal, QA Committee
Chuck Mann, Area Sources Committee
Mohammed Mazeed, Projections Committee
Tom Pace, PM-2.5 Committee
Herb Sherrow, Steering Committee
Roger Westman, Steering Committee
Garry Brooks, ERG
Linda Cooper, ERG

GENERAL ISSUES

Reports on the status and progress of active committees were given, followed by discussion of general interest items.

Area Sources Committee

Chuck Mann reported for this committee. He received recommended changes to the agricultural burning document from Tom Pace, and will revise the other documents on burning if the format is suitable. Their committee is finished with these documents and are now waiting on U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) review of these documents. Tom noted that he did not feel as strongly about the wild fires and prescribed burning documents, and offered to give the agricultural burning document to USDA the following week, and Chuck said to go ahead. Chuck also noted that he had received the first draft of the unpaved roads document from ERG. They are expecting a second draft of the autobody refinishing chapter and a first rough draft of the document on ammonia emissions from animal husbandry from ERG by the end of September, for which the latter needs more committee review as well as USDA review. They plan to use an expanded outline format, which appears to work better and be more favorably received by USDA. ERG will spend all their hours and will need new funds in the new fiscal year (FY) to continue work they expect to carry over. The committee has also had some discussion regarding the August EIIP Planning Workshop and he will pass on more news at their conference call scheduled for the next day.

Point Sources Committee

Roy Huntley reported for this committee. They are working on Chapter 12 on control device effectiveness and reliability for which they have tried to pull together existing information. It has been given to technical experts on their committee and is out for external review. They expect comments by the end of October. They have also spent about all their funds, but expect to have work to carry over to the new FY. Other ideas on the back burner they are considering for future efforts include republishing the Aerometric Information Retrieval System (AIRS) document with source classification codes (SCCs) and work on surrogate emission factors, and work for the wood products category.

PM-2.5 Committee

Tom Pace reported that this committee just recently put a final draft of their “Getting Started” document on the EIIP World Wide Web site, and noted that the PM-2.5 Resource Center would soon be accessible through the EIIP Web site if it is not already there. Their next meeting is scheduled for mid-October, during which they hope to start focusing on the PM needs identified at the Raleigh workshop. They also expect to spend all their funds in their current work assignment.

Projections Committee

Mohammed Mazeed reported for this group, whose last call was September 7. They have produced a final draft of their guidance document and five total documents are available that they hope to finalize by the end of September. In the next FY, the future directions they would like to pursue are to move from the documentation to the application phase, such as how to validate growth factors, predictions, and the growth model. They hope to assess ways to improve growth factors and how to apply them to different areas of the country. They hope to develop better growth models, as well as improve the association of SCCs and Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes in the Economic Growth Analysis System (EGAS). In addition, they will not meet in October, but plan to meet in early November. Greg Stella is away this week and Mohammed had no information on funding.

QA Committee

Bill Kuykendal noted that this committee was still inactive and had no significant activity to report except that a visitor from the Netherlands with an interest in verification and validation issues will be in the EFIG office for 4 weeks. They hope this will result in progress on their one outstanding document on this topic.

OTHER BUSINESS

Feedback on August EIIP Workshop

Steve Bromberg asked if the committees have discussed the August Workshop and asked for feedback from today's call participants or other members of their respective committees. Bob Betterton said he thought the meeting was pretty positive and very constructive. The Point Sources Committee discussed it during their last call, and Roy recalled Phil Lorang and Alice Fredlund had made comments about the Office of Mobile Sources, but no specifics. Mohammed said that the Projections Committee had not talked much about the meeting, but they liked the idea about topics related to growth factors. Chuck noted that the Area Sources Committee had briefly discussed what happened and had consensus on the good work done at the meeting, but that there was concern about the future committee structure and funding.

Roger also asked about whether the flip chart information regarding funding amounts and project descriptions was being reproduced since it was not being included in the Phase 2 report and it was good information he did not want to lose. Steve responded that he has this for all the high-priority projects on the first and second lists, but that the rest was not typed but he could get the rest done.

Future EIIP Committee Structure

Steve said there were no firm plans on this but that he and Dennis had discussed it, and Dennis will pass some ideas on to the Steering Committee soon. Steve hopes to have the committee structure developed in October so committees can write work assignments. He noted that the structure may look different although given the new projects table, it may look similar to the current structure. For example, the Point and Area Sources Committees may be combined to be address guidance in general. Including toxics is a high priority, which they anticipate to be a substantial effort and best for one group to address. A mobile source group is needed, and Steve expects the relatively new PM-2.5 and Projections Committees to continue although the name of the latter may change to address model inputs.

Funding

Steve reported that there was no change on this, he was fairly sure there would be funds for FY2000. Roger Westman asked about how this will be handled in the spring, that is, what to ask for and how to get it. Steve responded that these were his questions as well, but first the EIIP Phase 2 report must be addressed. A few comments have been received and it will be revised, but where should it be sent? Roger responded that it should be in the notebooks the air directors get at their upcoming meeting and he would take care of it. Steve will follow up on the report in time to get it in the notebooks. He noted that not many comments were received, and he hoped this was because

recipients felt good about it and not because of disinterest. He hopes to have it ready the following week.

Another question was raised regarding presentations to SAEWG and the air directors. Dennis is preparing overheads for the SAEWG meeting, and these can likely be used for the STAPPA/ALAPCO meeting as well. Roger said he had 15 minutes on the agenda and had advocated another topic on modeling, but this had been dropped due to time constraints. Steve, Dennis, and Roger will talk the following week about the best way to use the time allocated for Roger's presentation. Roger added that Dennis's presentation to SAEWG can be more extensive.

Roger's presentation will need to do the groundwork this fall to push the Phase 2 projects, highlight why EIIP is changing, and ask for support. More discussions will occur next spring concerning funding. Specifically, he believes a request for an endorsement for FY2001 funding is appropriate because requests must be made in the spring for funding the next fall. Also, Roger's presentation on EIIP to the STAPPA/ALAPCO training committee will be on November 1 in Nashville.

AWMA Conference

Steve asked for volunteers to help at the EIIP booth at the October AWMA conference in Raleigh. He asked that committee co-chairs not wait for their next conference call but go ahead and ask their members if they plan to come, if they will volunteer to help, and respond to Steve. Bob said he would attend and help.

STEERING COMMITTEE

Next Call

Steve recommended tentatively scheduling the next teleconference call for October 19, but will probably cancel it if nothing major arises that needs to be discussed. If the October 19 call is needed, it will be at 3 p.m. EDT and the call-in number will be (919) 541-4328. Steve will send out an e-mail to let everyone know whether the October call will be cancelled.



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
November 16, 1999

ATTENDEES

Dennis Beauregard, Steering Committee
Steve Bromberg, Steering Committee
Dennis Goodenow, Steering Committee
Roy Huntley, Point Sources Committee
Chuck Mann, Area Sources Committee
Mohammed Mazeed, Projections Committee
David Misenheimer, EFIG
Linda Murchison, Steering Committee
Tom Pace, PM-2.5 Committee
Ron Ryan, PCC Subcommittee
Greg Stella, Projections Committee
Lee Tooly, Data Management Committee
Roger Westman, Steering Committee
Jan Cortelyou, Air Pollution Training Institute (APTI)
Garry Brooks, ERG
Linda Cooper, ERG

GENERAL ISSUES

Reports on the status and progress of active committees were given, followed by discussion of general interest items.

Point Sources Committee

Roy Huntley reported for this committee. They are working on two projects now. One is Chapter 12 on control device effectiveness and reliability for which they have pulled together existing information on how each device operates. They have gotten good feedback from the industry trade group Institute of Clean Air Companies (ICAC) on it. They are also planning on reissuing the Aerometric Information Retrieval System (AIRS) emission factor document with a crosswalk of standard industrial classification (SIC) codes and source classification codes (SCCs) and are working on getting a cost estimate for this. They are also looking for ideas for other projects to pursue.

Area Sources Committee

Chuck Mann reported for this committee. They are working on three draft documents. The second draft on the unpaved roads document is coming along and they expect to finish it in December. The draft auto refinishing document has been sent out for committee review. It is a little behind schedule, but they expect to finish it in December or January. The first draft of the document on ammonia emissions from livestock is still rough but was sent out for committee review in September, and he has not received many comments yet.

PM-2.5 Committee

Tom Pace reported that this committee had their conference call the previous week and discussed projects to undertake this year. They have another call scheduled the Monday after Thanksgiving to continue this discussion. They are working off the high-priority project list from the August RTP conference. One project they will pursue is tracking of PM and PM-related research, and want to make sure they are spending scarce funds wisely on complementary work and not duplicating others' efforts, such as that underway in California. They discussed ammonia emissions from a variety of sources and a conceptual model. They expect to have an active work assignment in January.

Projections Committee

Greg Stella reported that this group had been inactive, and said they hoped to have an active work assignment in place to begin Phase 2 projection validation projects in calendar year 2000 in part because of holiday schedules and to hear the outcome of this meeting. Their next committee teleconference will be in December or January.

OTHER BUSINESS

Report on SAEWG Meeting

Dennis noted that work to flesh out the EIIP Phase 2 program had begun. Roger Westman and he made presentations at the SAEWG and STAPPA/ALAPCO meetings in October, and those audiences seemed supportive of the program.

Report on STAPPA/ALAPCO Presentation

Roger reported that he gave a condensed version of the presentation that Dennis gave at the SAEWG meeting, but it had a different objective. Dennis's presentation to SAEWG was to those already convinced of the value of and need for EIIP, whereas Roger's presentation to the air directors focussed on the need to continue EIIP and its funding. Roger presented a proposal to consider continuing funding. He recapped EIIP's history and achievements, and he had the full set of all EIIP

volumes that had been shipped to him as well as the new poster on display. The volumes clearly got some interest, because some disappeared overnight, but he got them all back. He also tried to leverage support with other STAPPA/ALAPCO committees, specifically the Mobile, Toxics, Criteria Pollutants, Training, Funding, and Emissions and Modeling Committees. He reiterated the need for Phase 2 from the survey conducted, and added the recommendation that EIIP would be “invented” again if this had not already been done. He felt like he got good support and positive feedback directly and in his subsequent presentation. The need for products was stressed as well as for new areas of work, particularly training and outreach.

Roger expects to go back in the spring for a more formal endorsement. He added that emission inventories were high on the list of possible topics to address at the spring meeting but low on a session they would like to hold, so there may not be a session allocated for this topic at the spring meeting. He also noted that he made a presentation to the Training Committee and highlighted the relevant different aspects, current products, and needs. He explained that the employee turnover at state and local agencies was significant, and the widespread practice of often using the newest employees or those inexperienced in inventories to develop inventory data made large learning curves typical. Jan Cortleyou, who also attended, said she had heard the same perspective informally from WESTAR staff regarding staff turnover and training in basics.

Phase 2 Preparations

Dennis started this discussion by introducing Jan Cortleyou from APTI, who he had invited to this meeting and expected to work with on training under Phase 2. Then he recapped that funds are available for work this year, and asked for input on what to do while EIIP waits to hear about whether Phase 2 will be implemented. He recommended doing what makes sense with the Phase 1 work, and that each current working committee review the EIIP Phase 2 plan specific projects. Specifically, they should identify the highest priority work and develop an estimate of resources to complete it, expand on the ideas already identified, and determine whether it can be done in the next year or so. He recommended that the program continue to conserve funds, keep in mind a logical and orderly close of work if appropriate, and identify the amount of funds that may need to be reserved. By the next call around mid-December, he hopes to have an outline and priority of projects and funds to complete them that could be initiated in early 2000. He added that safe ground would be an extension of work already conducted, and his concern that Phase 2 cannot be fully implemented until approval is obtained.

Dennis Goodenow recommended that a prime example would be to finish work on the process classification codes (PCCs), and this would use Phase 1 funds to get that work completed in a timely fashion. Roger expressed concern that funds should be used for the best purpose, and that when STAPPA/ALAPCO’s formal endorsement is requested, what has by then been accomplished can be stressed. He recommended that the highest-priority projects identified be capable of being done in 1 year.

Dennis Beauregard is taking steps to form a Toxics Committee and to reconstitute the Mobile Sources Committee, and for the latter he was soliciting support from EPA’s Office of Mobile Sources.

He noted that moving ahead with existing committee work would be the most responsible. Linda Murchison echoed the same recommendations. Lee Tooty said she would take a message back to the Data Management Committee (DMC) and Ron Ryan's PCC Subcommittee. Linda agreed that it was important that the appropriate committee hears these comments and added that the Steering Committee should follow up with individual committees.

Dennis asked that each committee co-chair look at the proposed EIIP Phase 2 proposed project list (available on the EIIP website), break it down logically by each committee's scope, and get each committee's feedback about whether it fits in their scope. He noted that a 1-year time frame was not critical and that project durations of 6 or even 18 months were feasible. He asked for greater detail in each project outlined and added that a new Toxics Committee had not been formed yet, nor have the Mobile or Biogenics Sources Committees been reconstituted yet.

Chuck Mann agreed, but because of the uncertainty regarding FY2001, he recommended scoping a program that could end in FY2000 if necessary. Since partial funding for the current fiscal year is expected, he concurred with moving ahead and starting to implement proposed work while exercising caution. Tom Pace noted that the PM-2.5 Committee had not spent any money yet, but that what was proposed was not inconsistent with the PM resource center and the ongoing PM work, which could be ended if necessary. Chuck asked if a new Mobile Sources Committee would focus on nonroad sources. This work had been targeted toward the Area Sources Committee, so he wondered if they should plan to do work in that area. Dennis responded that he was not sure. They have contacted the Office of Mobile Sources and hope to get their involvement. He asked if this question bears on a particular project. Chuck said no, but it factors into what his committee will or will not do depending on what the Mobile Sources Committee handles, and he added that traditionally that committee had not addressed nonroad sources.

Dennis noted that on an earlier call this day they were still seeking new EIIP members, and some had signed up at the November AWMA conference. He will send out the forms received to the current working committees so they can follow up to solicit their participation. Linda expressed concern because of past problems getting people involved. Dennis responded that there were two aspects to consider: new members were needed for new committees as well as for existing committees, and he hoped the existing committees would continue. Roger suggested this being added to highlights of the SAEWG meeting, that SAEWG is soliciting more participation, and those interested should contact Linda, Dennis Beauregard, or him. David Misenheimer recommended giving an alternate contact to EPA, such as Roger, because they do not want EPA to appear to be dominating efforts.

Greg asked that since the Projections Committee was new, how long should co-chairs serve? Dennis responded that some committees have had some personnel changes (e.g., Bill Gill moved on). Roger added that there were no rules on this; changes in members and leadership are fine as well as members and co-chairs continuing to participate--whatever works best--we do not want to lose the good people we have. Greg did not have specific recommendations, but he had heard some groups were stagnating and that new views should be solicited. Dennis noted that more outreach was needed.

Lee noted that her impression was that the DMC would remain inactive. She asked if that was correct since not many DMC items were suggested. Dennis responded that there was one project on National Emissions Trends (NET) input format. Roger noted that it was appropriate to reconstitute this committee for that work, but he was not sure the same people were available and interested. David recommended that instead of giving just a general call for new members, more specific information about projects and their needs should be provided. Jan suggested considering a satellite broadcast to focus on what EIIP has done and the plans for the future. New participants could also be solicited. Dennis said he would include these ideas in a training plan.

STEERING COMMITTEE

Personnel Changes

Dennis noted that Steve Bromberg will be retiring soon, that Steve had handed off the EIIP coordination role he had done for years, and this is why Dennis was chairing this call. Steve will be at EPA for a few more months and will continue to be involved in EIIP matters.

Next Call

The next teleconference call was scheduled for Tuesday, December 14 at 3 p.m. EST and the call-in number will be (919) 541-4248, and Conference Room 322 has been reserved in the 4201 Building. Dennis reminded participants that each working committee should review the EIIP Phase 2 plan, Future Directions for the Millennium, and identify the highest priority projects for their committees, outline an approach for each project that can be completed within about 1 year, and give an estimate of resources required.



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
December 14, 1999

ATTENDEES

Dennis Beauregard, Steering Committee
Bob Betterton, Point Sources Committee
Cyril Durrenberger, Steering Committee
Roy Huntley, Point Sources Committee
Chuck Mann, Area Sources Committee
David Misenheimer, EFIG
Garry Brooks, ERG
Linda Cooper, ERG

GENERAL ISSUES

Reports on the status and progress of active committees were given, followed by discussion of general interest items.

Point Sources Committee

Roy Huntley reported for the PSC. They are now working only on two projects, but did discuss possible Phase 2 projects and Bob Betterton will present that later. On Chapter 12 on control device effectiveness and reliability, they have completed review of comments received and expect to have a final draft the first week of January. On the AIRS emission factor document they plan to reissue, another subcommittee meeting is planned, and they also expect a revised draft of that document the first week of January.

Area Sources Committee

Chuck Mann reported for the ASC. He has received the second draft of the unpaved roads document, but plans to distribute it in January because of the holidays. Committee comments on the draft auto refinishing document are now being incorporated. This covers all current activities except for the Phase 2 discussions.

FY2000 PROJECTS

Area Sources Committee

Chuck reported for the ASC on this also. A high priority is to finish their current draft documents on unpaved roads, auto body refinishing, and ammonia emissions from livestock. Another priority that will not require a large amount of funding is document maintenance needs, which involves updating some of their existing, completed documents. The main project they envision is a review of area source emission factors in existing EIIP area source chapters; they will not get into emission factor development. They would possibly use Data Attribute Rating System (DARS) methods to evaluate the existing emission factors and determine which factors can be updated. A number of source categories involve organic solvent consumption, and the emission factors they would focus on use either pounds per employee or pounds per capita. They expect to determine national solvent consumption factors and speciation factors, identify individual HAPs if possible, and also look at spatial and temporal allocations. Chuck referred to an ORD report prepared by Pechan/Avanti for Lee Tooty that he has, which could be used as a blueprint to help review and identify which categories to work on. It could be an area of substantial activity and involve updating emission methodologies for organic solvents in chapters on architectural coatings, solvent cleaning, consumer and commercial products, graphic arts, traffic painting, industrial maintenance coatings, and dry cleaning.

Dennis asked if the updated factors would go down to the state level. Chuck responded that they could be applied to local populations, and they would use a national emissions estimate based on a surrogate. Dennis asked how many documents needed to be updated; Chuck responded six or seven plus Chapter 1. Cyril Durrenberger asked about the estimated cost; Chuck replied he had a rough one and anticipated it would be a relatively modest activity. Dennis was not comfortable discussing funding amounts during the call, and he and Chuck should talk about this later.

Chuck noted that there were additional areas where action was needed, but would be premature because they were too big or could not be done in 1 to 1-1/2 years, but other committees might consider them. These included nonroad mobile source emission factors, spatial and temporal allocation profiles needed for dispersion modeling, and work to supplement the Area Source Emission Model (ASEM). On nonroad factors, the ASC did not see that as being part of their charter and hoped a revived Mobile Sources Committee would produce these factors. Some ASC members suggested that EIIP should consider forming a separate modeling committee to investigate the spatial and temporal profiles issue since this area has relevance to most of the EIIP committees. They felt it would not be appropriate for the ASC to be investigating the profile issue for all of EIIP. The ASC felt that it would be premature to spend resources in support of any ASEM activities at this time, since the model has not been released in beta form yet. They recommend waiting to see how the beta version performs and what issues may arise so that any future support could be better targeted. Chuck also noted that work in the training and communications areas is still needed; however, the main need there

is for people's time. Inventory staff in the various agencies to need to find ways share their knowledge with others in the community.

A lengthy discussion took place on the topic of the need for guidance on when to conduct a survey to gather data for inventory development. Chuck explained that even though the August EIIP workshop had produced a conclusion that such survey guidance was a high priority, the majority of the ASC had decided not to pursue this as an FY2000 project. Information relevant to surveys could be incorporated into training activities. Dennis commented that during the last PSC call, Alice Fredlund of Louisiana stated that she felt the Phase 2 Plan report did not define the survey needs project very well. She felt that instead of being a project to address when to do surveys, the project should address how to put a survey together and how the survey should be conducted. Chuck agreed that training was needed on survey approaches and which techniques were valid, but he did not think Alice's comment would likely change the ASC's perspective on the survey question.

Cyril added that he too had seen instances where inventory personnel do not know how to structure a survey, what survey questions to ask, when and how to conduct the survey, and how to target who receives the survey. He believed it would be useful for inventory staff to get more information on the topic such as learning what types of surveys other groups have done and how successful these were, what types of example questions were asked, are there some "lessons learned" that are useful to pass on, and are there any kind of survey templates available. He recommended trying to at least gather together existing guidance information on surveys and make that available. Cyril indicated that he had learned EPA will likely be naming several new areas as nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone standard and many of these will not have ever done an area source SIP inventory before. They will need input on the use of surveys to develop area source inventories.

Bob Betterton was disappointed to hear of no plans to go forward with a chapter on surveys and suggested that a technical assistance paper may be helpful. He stressed the importance on finding a forum to share knowledge on surveys. Cyril added that an EIIP document to train personnel who are trying to do a survey for the first time could be very helpful to personnel in some Texas cities. Bob asked when their next call is scheduled so he could make sure their area sources person participated. Chuck responded that it will be January 12, 11 a.m. EST; the call-in number is 919-541-1590.

Dennis also noted that one project had been proposed to update separate per capita printing emission factors, which were frequently based on out-of-date information. Cyril added that this category has a lot of changes (manufacturers are constantly switching from solvent-based inks to water-based ones) and currently available information was sometimes obsolete. Chuck agreed that it would be really difficult to keep such factors up to date.

Point Sources Committee

Bob Betterton reported on the PSC's discussions. Toxics was a big topic and work on this would have a lot of value as well as that on PM-fines. He also noted ammonia emissions related to electric utility point sources, specifically for selective catalytic reduction (SCR) and non-SCR. The closer one gets to the design capacity of such devices, the more ammonia that gets through, which could add up to tons at electric utilities. Bob was not sure how significant these emissions are since ammonia is not a regulated pollutant, but he said the data could be handed off for modeling. Roy added that Alice Fredlund had mentioned that improvements to the Biogenic Emissions Inventory System (BEIS) should be a higher priority.

Bob noted that the PSC had tabled a lot of projects, and specifically ones on the graphic arts and wood products industries. He said that Dallas Safriet had been on target when he had asked the PSC to wait for updates to the AP-42 chapter on wood products, and they had decided not to pursue this unless there was more interest. Bob also stated that he had received an e-mail from someone in the graphic arts industry asking that since there was a separate MACT for the graphic arts category, why was there not EIIP point source emission inventory guidance on it. This person had noted there was an ASC chapter on graphic arts. Bob added that maybe graphic arts was more appropriate under area sources than point sources, but he was wondering if there were any such facilities large enough to be considered point sources.

Bob also said that the chemical manufacturing industry really needs to be looked at but it is a very large category and will likely need further subcategorization. He has spoken with Title V permit engineers and chemists about their special needs and asked if they were comfortable with the data they received from the industry. One issue raised pertained to confidentiality--data were reported as confidential and there was concern about proprietary information. He asked how a regulatory authority can review emissions for reasonableness in such a case. For example, for a batch or continuous process, the reviewer would not even know what chemicals were emitted. Bob noted that some type of QA protocol would be beneficial here. Dennis commented that the QA Committee was starting to look into this need. Bob added that EPA focuses on 33 high-priority HAPs, which means a lot of information to look at. Bob stated that general guidance or preferred methods would be useful for organics and inorganics as well as batch versus continuous processes.

Bob also noted concern about compliance effectiveness since facilities may not always be in compliance. The PSC has developed a chapter on rule effectiveness for SIPs and control device variability. For example, if a facility had a bad compliance history, a standardized protocol could be used to make adjustments. He also expressed interest in data collection standardization, including formal protocols for data model input. He noted little had been standardized, but that the data model was a good start.

Bob also brought up the topic of surrogate emission factors and referred to an article Ron Ryan did for the CHIEF newsletter a while back. In South Carolina, they charge fees for emission inventories, and are very sensitive about using surrogate factors. No guidance on their use is available

to inventory or permit preparers, and he recommended a chapter, paper, or something in between on this. He would also support guidance on source testing, which he thought would be especially beneficial for the PM-2.5 committee.

OTHER BUSINESS

Other Phase 2 Projects

David Misenheimer noted the need for good, consistent QA procedures, especially for the reasonableness of emission estimates. He said that a lot of errors are mistakes that are not meant to purposefully misinform, and he recommended developing better QA procedures. He said Bill Kuykendal and Tom Ballou have been discussing work the QA Committee may pursue. David also recommended prioritizing lists of toxic pollutants, especially for specific source categories, since it would be impossible to do them all. He recommended identifying those with the highest risks for toxicity. Bob responded that this sounded reasonable and added that the PM-2.5 Committee was developing a nice web page and resource center with links to other groups' information that could automatically link a user to a PSC web page, for example. He recommended each committee look at this to identify their own areas of expertise.

Dennis summarized the discussion by stating there would be a future for EIIP in 2000, and any uncertainty would be a year after that. He recommended the committees narrow down their suggestions to a few things they can do well and propose one-year projects that they think they can get done. Cyril asked that costs be included since more work has been discussed than there are funds for. Dennis added that efforts to form a Toxics Committee and reconstitute the Mobile Sources Committee are taking shape. For the latter, a meeting is planned in January with EPA's Office Mobile Sources (OMS) to include Rob Altenburg, David Misenheimer, Laurel Driver, and Cyril. Cyril is following up with OMS so they are active participants, and he has a list of potential projects so this group would have suggestions if this committee is re-formed. Dennis reported he had called Tom Pierce about reviving the Biogenics Committee, and Tom would be an obvious possible EPA co-chair. He added that benchmarking and mentoring were also ideas mentioned for the Phase 2 plan. A conference call with STAPPA/ALAPCO is being planned for late January to solicit more input on EIIP Phase 2. Cyril emphasized that this could determine the future of EIIP as well as its funding, and that it was important to get word about EIIP work out. Dennis planned to send e-mails to solicit input for the program.

Fall Workshop

Dennis said that discussions had begun on a technical and policy workshop to be held in August or later in the fall in Raleigh. Roy may take the lead on this since he was the technical chair at the recent AWMA inventory conference. Formal training sessions as well as working-level meetings are being

considered. Since the next emission inventory conference is scheduled in spring 2001, a fall workshop might work well.

STEERING COMMITTEE

Next Call

The next teleconference call was scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 2000, at 3 p.m. EST and the call-in number will be (919) 541-4248. Dennis reminded participants that each working committee should e-mail him the projects they want to proceed with and the funding requirements so he can share this with the Steering Committee and discuss funding.